

-12-

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on December 31, 2007, Applicant(s) respectfully request(s) reconsideration.

Claims 1-29 now pending in this Application.

Claims 4-7, 9-12, 17-20 and 22-25 have been indicated as being in condition for allowance.

In this Amendment, claims 1, 14, 27 and 29 been amended and claim 28 has been cancelled.

Claims 1, 14, 27 and 29 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. Applicant(s) believe that the claim(s) as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 8, 13-16, 21 and 26-29 have been rejected under **35 U.S.C. §103** as being obvious over Allen, U.S. Pub No. 2005/0219039 in view of Allen, U.S. Patent No. 6,486,769 (hereinafter Allen 769). Specifically, with respect to claim 1, The Office Action suggests that McLean anticipates the claimed step of determining a location for disposing each a plurality of the transceivers.

McLean '769 presents a mechanism for determining placement using two RFID components (checktags A and B). In contrast, the present approach employs an interference effect between a single RFID tag and a particular transceiver. Therefore, the cited McLean approach requires a relative differential between two checktags, while in contrast, the claimed approach determin[es] an interference effect based on transponder coverage material between each of the transceivers and a particular transponder, as now recited in amended claim 1, to clarify the distinction between McLean and Applicant's invention. Claim 1 has been further amended to recite that the readability zone is computed based on the identified attributes and the determined interference effect, as disclosed at page 5, lines 6-21. There is no showing, teaching, or disclosure in McLean '769, alone or in combination, of the claimed determination of the interference effect based on transponder coverage material between each of the transceivers and a particular transponder.

-13-

Claim 28 has been cancelled as being merely cumulative with other claims of record.

Independent claims 14, 27 and 29, rejected on similar grounds, have been likewise amended. As the remaining claims all depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 14, it is respectfully submitted that all claims in the case are now in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is therefore requested.

Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

/CJL/

Christopher J. Lutz, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 44,883
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: SUN03-13(040484)

Dated: March 31, 2008